Northeastern IPM Center Partnership Grants Impacts

New England Fruit and Vegetable Scouting Network (2014-2015)

Project Directors: Katie Campbell-Nelson; Ann Hazelrigg; Andy Radin - University of Massachusetts

Author: David Lane - Cornell University



THE NEED

- IPM is based on robust, accurate, and current data about evolving pest threats.
- Scouting is an essential IPM tactic for monitoring pest data.

IMPACTS



Pest scouting. Photo: Katie Campbell Nelson.



Pest scouting. Photo: Katie Campbell Nelson.



Pest scouting. Photo: Katie Campbell Nelson.



Training for pest scouting. Photo: Katie Campbell Nelson.

- The impact of field walk training, scouting, and the pest advisory system will be to prepare the next generation of IPM farm scouts to be familiar with pest life cycles and able to use available tools to make educated decisions in
- Directly impacted over 300 acres of fruit and vegetable farmland on 12 farms in MA, RI and VT. IPM strategies implemented on these farms, and their benefits, included:
 - Improved timing of pesticide applications on crops by using monitoring.
 - Correct identification of pests, relying in part on enhanced knowledge of insect life stages, resulted in better pest control.
 - Using traps to monitor pests such as squash vine borer and European corn borer (ECB) resulted in better-timed release of the parasitoid *Trichogramma* wasp to control ECB in peppers and sweet corn on three farms.
 - Improved sprayer mixing and calibration for better pest control.
- Project participants performed over 240 hours of IPM scouting and monitoring.
- Reached 3,500 people and received \$582,000 over three years via a grant titled "Multi-Level Extension Delivery to Support IPM for MA Vegetable and Fruit Growers," funded by USDA-NIFA.

WEBSITE

ag.umass.edu/vegetable/outreach-project/new-england-pest-scouting-network

This work is supported by Crop Protection and Pest Management Program (CPPM) grant numbers 2018-70006-28882 and 2014-70006-22484 from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.